HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 19 Saturday, May 11, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Post Mortem: Senators discussing the whole McCarthy affair in gatherings at the time of the funeral early this week came to one foreboding conclusion: that the forces which wore down the Wisconsin Senator still possess great vitality (witness their recent reactivation in whitewashing Canadian diplomat Norman) and still have at their disposal very well-oiled machinery for publicity and blackmail, ready to go into action against anti-communism at any time.

Recognition of the "facts of political life" about the McCarthy affair is necessary — Senators agreed — if American public men are to checkmate the above-mentioned forces effectively. First of all, this recognition requires revision of the common "liberal" version of how it all started, back in February 1950. It did not develop haphazardly, or merely as a result of supposed public reaction against Senator McCarthy's first charges in that month about subversives in Government — according to some who have made a study of the famous affair.

On the contrary, what actually happened was that McCarthy was coldly and calculatingly "selected" by a strategy committee of "liberals" as the man to be discredited, to be "made an example of," thereby preventing the development of another Alger Hiss case (which had left severe scars on the prestige of the Left at that time).

"They" chose McCarthy instead of Nixon or Mundt, then the best-known antagonists of communism on Capitol Hill, for sound reasons of political strategy. Nixon and Mundt were experienced operators in the parliamentary scene and both had served a number of terms in the House before going to the Senate.

McCarthy, on the other hand, was the most obscure of Senate "freshmen," had not picked up much experience, and indeed seemed timid and unsure of himself at that time. He appeared, to the strategists of the Left, an ideal victim. They would confuse him, scare him, smear him and thus put an end to the then growing "Communists in Government" issue, once and for all. McCarthy's speech in Wheeling, attacking Communists in Government, which actually got little press notice the next day, was followed by a pause, during which "they" made the decision — and choice.

To their surprise, McCarthy proved far tougher and more resourceful than expected, and it took over four years — in which they had to pull out all the stops — to wear him down, physically and politically. So runs one analysis of the famous affair, an analysis which is shared not only by many veteran legislators but also by correspondents in Washington (whether they dare to say so openly or not).

Two topics in particular, relevant to this picture, enlivened discussions of the Senators on the funeral planes which went to Appleton, Wisconsin:

(1) Some discovered the fact, just going the rounds on the Hill, that the State Department, in the past year, found (and discharged) a "card-carrying Communist" among its personnel.

The individual was a clerical worker and not in a high or "sensitive" position. No publicity was given the matter — for one reason, because "White House policy" since the censure of McCarthy wanted it that way; and, secondly, because security officials know full well that it is not "card carrying" Communists, but crypto-Communists or "liberal dupes" who present the biggest danger in the Executive arm of the Government. They, indeed, are very "hard to get at."

(2) The second topic was little known even to some well-informed Senators. What set off the Norman case was material resulting from the discovery in the Treasury Department of hitherto well-concealed files of the famous Harry Dexter White, Soviet agent and former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. These files were first spotted by investigators outside of the Treasury late in 1955. Up until then, even the F.B.I. had no knowledge of their existence.

The files contained much material showing that White was a far more important cog in the Soviet secret machine than had been definitely known before. There was much material filling out knowledge of a wide range of activities by the dead official; and finally, information which led the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to break the story which touched off the affair of the Canadian diplomat.

Why the Treasury (which had previously been deemed very "clean of lefties") failed to find this material earlier and to bring it to the attention of the F.B.I. remains a disturbing question. Senators ask: is the "red network" so artfully imbedded in the ranks of the bureaucracy that it takes years for Hoover's alert men to uncover one of its most important segments? Must we again fight a "McCarthy" battle? And, if so, where

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can we find a legislator who is ready to brave the secret "forces" and their "smear machinery"?

Not Merely Gossip: According to well-informed diplomatic sources, Field Marshal Montgomery, during his recent visit to President Eisenhower in Gettysburg, is said to have warned his host of three possibilities in the international situation: (1) war in the Far East, following extensive buildup of Red military forces in China and Korea; (2) fading of political strength of Premier Adenauer in Germany, who seeks re-election; and (3) declining power of the Tory party in Britain.

● A story — typifying the yawning division within the Democratic Party — is going the rounds of Capitol Hill. It is about Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democratic leader of the Senate. When the Democratic "Advisory Council," packed with party "liberals," held its rather unsuccessful meeting in Washington last Friday, Johnson was invited to attend. He declined, saying that he would be away on business in Texas. Neither he nor Speaker Sam Rayburn have any use for the "Advisory Council." Friday was the day after McCarthy's death, and GOP Senators tried to get in touch with Johnson to clear decisions as to the Senate funeral. Johnson's office said he was in Texas, and the Republicans phoned a number of places in that state where they hoped to find him — in vain. Finally, on advice from a smiling Democratic colleague, they went over to Johnson's Washington apartment where they found him "holed up" — for the balance of the Advisory Council's stay.

● One of Ike's most important — and best — appointments recently was that of Robert C. Hill as Ambassador to Mexico. Hill (he's 40) is one of the younger very anti-Communist generation of State Department officials, as distinct from the "old line" diplomats like Bohlen and Thompson, who learned to be "soft on communism" under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Hill faces a big job in Mexico, for it is thought that Moscow will seek to make that country a focal point to discredit "Yanquis" in Latin America. Next year Mexico must choose a new President. Old ex-President Cardenas, relict of the "red" days of 20 years ago, is reportedly seeking to control the election in order to put a pro-Communist candidate in the Presidential Palace.

● This much is known about Robert B. Anderson, former Deputy Secretary of Defense, who is now expected to be appointed Secretary of the Treasury when Secretary Humphrey retires: In 1955, his name was suggested to Secretary of State Dulles to be Under Secretary of State, to succeed the then Under Secretary Herbert Hoover, Jr. Hoover reportedly approved the selection and so did Dulles. However, the White House Palace Guard opposed Anderson (for what reason, it is not known). Conservatives on Capitol Hill who know of the incident are prejudiced in Anderson's favor — although they doubt that he will prove as strong a fighter for fiscal solvency as Humphrey.

Economy Front: Many signs point to a continuing tide of popular and Congressional opposition to the Administration's high Budget. Particularly discouraging to the White House spenders are the following items:

● The House reduced, by slightly less than half, deficiency appropriations requested by the Administration to piece out the current fiscal year. A large part of the reduction was $50 million requested for a program of Federal flood control. In addition, the House rejected an amendment, offered by Representative Boland (D.-Mass.) to provide $14 million for flood insurance. Among those opposing this move was Representative Thomas (D.-Tex.). Thomas' opposition, in spite of the fact that his home state has been hit by floods, is cited as evidence that most of the legislators are approaching the question of economy from the perspective of long-term national interest.

● The House Committee on Education and Labor cut the proposed school bill from $2 billion to $1.5 billion. Numerous press accounts are attributing this and the afore-mentioned deficiency bill to cut to prevailing sentiment for economy.

● Ultra-New Deal Senator Paul Douglas, in a television interview, advocated a cut in the Budget of $2.5 billion to $3 billion — adding that the Budget surplus from the cut should be applied to the national debt. Sounding like his colleague, Senator Byrd of Virginia, Douglas asked: "If we do not cut the national debt in a time of prosperity, when will we do so?"

● Reports from New York state last week indicated that economy sentiment is filtering up through spending programs in the states. Since January 1, New York voters at the school district level have rejected 11 of 31 proposed bond issues for school loans. "The temper of voters," commented *The New York Times,* is likely "to influence Representatives in Congress from New York on the related matters of reducing President Eisenhower's Budget requests and Federal taxes."

● The Illinois GOP delegation to the House obtained a report (from the Legislative Reference Service) which serves to bring home forcefully to voters the cost of Federal spending programs. The report disclosed that Illinois taxpayers have, since the inception of America's "giveaway" ventures, paid out over $7.5 billion in foreign aid funds. The people of Chicago alone, it was revealed, have paid almost $4 billion.

Business Revolt: Signs of angry business discontent with the President are appearing, as foreshadowed by HUMAN EVENTS three months

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ago. On May 8, W. H. Doerfner, a high General Motors Corporation official, in a letter to President Eisenhower (released to the press), assailed the President's "repudiation" of his campaign-stated beliefs in sound businesslike Government, and announced that he (Doerfner) would no longer support either Ike or the Republican party. The latter, he said, he would not back as long as it supported "your New Deal inspired international WPA." Doerfner was a former strong supporter of the President and is still a member of the Saginaw County (Michigan) GOP finance committee.

Doerfner's bitterness about what he brands repudiation of Ike's campaign oratory is similar to many private outbursts noted here in Washington at the recent U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting. Doerfner says: "What once appeared to be an inspired 'crusade' now appears to have been the usual campaign of political expediency with early words and later actions bearing little relationship with each other."

At the same day, in the same city, Ross Roy, the President of the Detroit Board of Commerce — a Republican who voted for Ike in 1952 and 1956 — came out in opposition to giving the President free radio and TV time to explain his Budget. "The whole concept," he said, "of our President being able to demand time from radio and television networks to sell his views, is a dangerous one. Even on an issue entirely noncontroversial it is giving the party in power advantage over the party not in power."

Teamsters: Atop all its other woes, the giant Teamsters Union now finds itself facing what amounts to a trial on charges that, as an employer, it indulges in unfair labor practices.

So says the Supreme Court, in ordering the National Labor Relations Board to rule on the merits of unfair labor practice charges filed with the N.L.R.B. by the Office Employes International Union against, of all people, the Teamsters Union.

The Office Workers Union said in its complaint to the Board that it sought to organize the 23 clerical workers in the Portland, Oregon, headquarters of the Teamsters, but that the latter union retaliated by soliciting membership in one of its (Teamsters) own locals and discharging several workers for activities in support of the Office Workers Union.

Two N.L.R.B. members held the Teamsters had clearly been unfair to the other union, in violation of the Taft-Hartley law. The three-member majority, however, held that labor unions are nonprofit organizations exempt from the Act.

Said Associate Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark this week, for a 5-4 majority: "When a labor union takes on the role of an employer the law applies to its operations just as it would to any other employers."

The case now goes back to the N.L.R.B. for decision on the merits of the original complaint. One more trial for the Teamsters.

Leftist Court: Newest evidence of the leftward trend of the "Earl Warren" Supreme Court came this week in two decisions circumscribing the rights of states to deny licenses to practice law because of past or suspected Communist party membership.

One case, from New Mexico, involved a would-be lawyer who admitted having been a Communist in the 1930's but who said he left the party in 1940. The Supreme Court, in an 8 to 0 decision, said the state's denial of membership in its judicial bar deprived him of the due process guaranteed by the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

The second case, from California, concerned one Raphael Konigsberg, who refused to answer questions about Communist associations. He had been identified by a former Communist, in testimony before a California legislative committee, as having attended meetings of a Communist cell.

Konigsberg was asked about this and other associations by state bar examiners; he refused to answer, on the typically leftist grounds that the questions concerned only his personal political beliefs and represented an unwarranted intrusion on his constitutional rights of speech and thought.

The Court's five-justice majority in this case agreed with Konigsberg's contention that his refusal to answer did not prove he was lacking in good character, and therefore was not proper grounds for refusing him a license.

Justice Felix Frankfurter dissented on technical jurisdictional grounds. Justice John M. Harlan, in a dissent in which Justice Tom Clark concurred, held that the questions were relevant and did not violate any constitutional rights, and that by holding otherwise the High Court "imposed its own notions of public policy and judgment on California."

Justice Hugo Black wrote both majority opinions. The Court's newest member, Justice Charles E. Whittaker, did not participate in either case.

Foreign Aid: A recent report on "United States Foreign Assistance Programs," prepared for the Special Senate Committee on foreign aid, adds fuel to Capital feeling against foreign "giveaways." The report, prepared by Clement Johnston, Chairman of the Board of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, demonstrates how American aid can actually *hurt* a foreign nation rather than help it.

The report singles out "the United States decision to support the currencies of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia at the arbitrary rate of 35 piasters or other local currency to the dollar." Now, the report observes, when these currencies are de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preciating in value, this exchange "figure is utterly unrealistic," with the result that "large windfall profits are being made by importers and merchants importing at a 35 piaster rate and selling on a 75 to 100 general market rate."

The effect of this situation is that "the faith of the newly freed people of the area in the integrity of democratic government is shaken by the spectacle of the undeserved enrichment of a favored group."

American laxness in this matter, it is observed, allows foreign Governments to indulge in irresponsible fiscal practices — budget deficits, and "a singular reluctance to exercise vigorously their taxing authority." The result of these practices is still more inflation — throwing our arbitrary rate of exchange even further out of balance.

Similar misdirected attempts at "assistance," it is said, are also extended to such countries as France and Italy.

RFC: President Eisenhower recently submitted to Congress his first Government reorganization plan of 1957. It would abolish — guess what: the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which most people (except the few still on its payroll) believed to have died long since.

The RFC was established as an emergency lending agency when the depression first hit during the Hoover Administration; but, like most emergency agencies, it proved to be something more than temporary. It expanded under the New Deal, blossomed even more resplendently during the war, and then, under the Truman Administration, became the vehicle of the pastel mink coat and other scandals too numerous to mention.

One of the first things that Eisenhower did when he became President was to agree to the suggestion of a group of Congressional leaders that the RFC be allowed to die when its then current authorization expired on June 30, 1954. That it was believed to have done.

This week it developed that liquidation of any Government agency is a long, drawn-out task, and requires a full staff to supervise the liquidation. Eisenhower's "reorganization" order demonstrates that, even here, there will be no saving: the RFC's functions are to be shifted to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, meaning that jobs will be found in those agencies for all employees now on the RFC payroll.

Capital comment: Another example of the difficulty of ever getting rid of a Government agency once life is breathed into it.

Book Front: *In the Court of Public Opinion,* by Alger Hiss; Alfred A. Knopf; $5.

This book may turn out to be a decisive "exam" in the education of American "liberals." In the years immediately following Whittaker Chambers' charges before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "respectable people" closed ranks to protest Hiss' innocence and to trample Chambers' character and reputation. After two gruelling trials, a jury convicted Hiss — and the "liberals" backed away. This volume, an elaborate recital of Hiss' defense and appeal arguments, may show whether the "liberals" can be conned the second time around.

Judging by the book itself, they shouldn't be. Hiss' argument is incredible on the face of it. For example: a substantive point in the case was how Hiss had disposed of his 1929 Ford roadster; Hiss claimed that he had given it to Chambers in the summer of 1935; Chambers claimed that Hiss had arranged to transfer it to the Communist party. The records showed that Hiss did not sign over the title of the car until July 23, 1936; and that, after its purchase by the Cherner Motor Company, it was resold (*on the same day*) to one William Rosen, who invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked about the car and whether he was a Communist. Hiss' effort to reconcile the cold record with his own testimony (pp. 115-122) should encourage all who have not yet despaired of squaring the circle.

More impressive to some readers than such acrobatics — made familiar by the hearings and trials — may be the arguments marshalled by Hiss' attorneys in their several appeal attempts. When analyzed, however, these protests are even more inherently implausible than Hiss' explanation of the Ford transaction. In a libel suit brought by Hiss, Chambers produced a sheaf of 65 typewritten pages — copies of Government papers — which analysis showed to have been typed on the same typewriter as documents acknowledged to have been typed on the Hiss Woodstock.

The Hiss theory is that Chambers constructed a typewriter so much like the Hiss machine that it would fool the experts. To show that such a deception was possible, Hiss' attorney hired an expert typewriter engineer, who undertook to construct a typewriter that would duplicate the Hiss machine, and an expert document examiner to check on the progress of this delicate work. After an unspecified period of time (apparently more than a year), Hiss' attorney alleges, the work of these two experts produced "relative, even if not complete, success."

This evidence is supposed to establish the "possibility" of forgery. *Yet the Hiss theory also asks us to believe that Chambers built the typewriter and forged the documents (to defeat Hiss' libel suit) between September 27 (when Hiss filed the suit) and November 17 (when Chambers produced the papers) of 1948!* Not only that, but the Hiss theory further asks us to believe that Chambers, after thus outperforming the typewriter engineers and document experts, planted his faked typewriter where he knew that Hiss' attorneys would find it and introduce it as evidence for the defense (which they did).

Even if they are given serious consideration, however, these improbable arguments as to what *might* have happened do not shake the prosecution's thesis: that the documents which Chambers produced and the so-called "Hiss standards" were indeed typed on the same typewriter. J. Edgar Hoover, for instance, this week disclosed that the typing in the documents Chambers produced is identical with that on an application for a Government job typed on the Hiss Woodstock.

On the whole, Hiss might have served himself better by leaving this book unwritten.

(As noted in HUMAN EVENTS last week, copies of *In the Court of Public Opinion* may be obtained from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y., at the bookstore price of $5. Purchasers also receive a free copy of Whittaker Chambers' *Witness.*)

Letter from RICHARD F. LEWIS, JR., Winchester, Va., owner of Radio Stations WSIG, WAGE, WFVA, WAYZ, WHYL, WELD, WRFL and WINC: "I want you to know how much HUMAN EVENTS is appreciated in our home. All of us read it first always. You give the important news that somehow nowadays does not get into the papers or magazines."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year, by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 19 HUMAN EVENTS May 11, 1957

Article Section

BEWARE THE JUDAS GOAT
Or: Where Do Conservatives Go From Here?

By HOWARD BUFFETT

AT THE BIG Omaha packing houses, automation and push-button equipment have taken their toll of personnel, but one key employee does his job just as he did 50 years ago. This employee is a four-legged animal with a picturesque title. He is known as the Judas goat.

He is called "the Judas goat" because he leads lambs and sheep from the outside storage pens to the killing floor in the packing house. The sheep, tightly packed together, nose to rump, follow him blindly, stupidly, trustingly — even though they become panicky from the smell of blood as they near the fatal room.

But then it is too late. Arriving there with his charges, the Judas goat backs away, his head averted. He nonchalantly heads back to the pens for another batch, and in this fashion he may lead as many as 1,000 sheep a day to slaughter.

In detailing the Judas goat's task, no judgment on his behavior is implied. His animal kinship to the sheep has provided him with an easy job. The sheep trust him by instinct as one of their kind, so they follow him. He is aware of no moral code, either by training or otherwise. He is "on the team," doing his part in the organization efficiently and faithfully. His material well-being and survival are thus protected. He is well-adjusted, and after a fashion, self-supporting.

In the collectivist age in which we live, Judas goats of the two-legged variety are in great demand, and generally doing very well. In many phases of life the follow-the-leader proclivities they inspire are harmless — or relatively so. But, with the human counterparts of the Judas goats who operate in the political field, it is another story.

IN MANY COUNTRIES in our day these two-legged Judas goats have used their talents to lead trusting peoples into slavery and slaughter. Such disasters have happened to religious and educated nations as well as lands where superstition and ignorance are rife. So no one possessing a modicum of humility will conclude that the cruel collectivist tyrannies that have occurred elsewhere cannot happen here.

Accordingly, the transcendent political duty of the citizen today is to develop an effective vigilance against a similar tragedy happening in America.

This task cannot be entrusted to the politicians of the major parties. It is largely they who have put us in the position where the main collectivist evils — militarism, inflation and uncurbed Federal intervention — threaten to make us a nation of subjects.

In this crisis, American conservatives are on their own. No longer do they have a major political party loyal to the principles that undergird government by the people. This is an unpleasant truth to contemplate, and a much harder one to face up to courageously; yet if

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collectivism is to be turned back, surely the time is here when conservatives must mount an effective counterattack.

How can this be done? What are the tactics available to us, and which of those offer the greatest promise of victory? How do conservatives registered in the two parties develop a constructive and workable political strategy?

Until a few months ago, many intelligent Americans believed that the Eisenhower Administration was essentially conservative. The President's demand for large-scale intervention in the Near East, his myriad new domestic spending schemes, and his $70-odd billion Budget have shattered that illusion.

The American people, aside from pocketbook patriots and die-hard party regulars, now recognize that the modern Republican party, like the Democratic party, is obsessed with the "State shall become God" concept.

Debate about the intentions or end results of rule by either of the major parties under their present leadership has become foolish. Their common terminus, regardless of details or campaign oratory, is socialism.

Facing the tough odds posed by the financial and mass propaganda weapons held by the major parties, some conservatives will wring their hands and declare the situation is hopeless.

THOSE WHO WOULD give up are not only cowardly, but their position is clearly untenable. Conservatives cast a majority Presidential vote in 1932,* at the depths of a depression. In 1952,** after the party in power had entrenched itself for 20 years with public funds, conservatives again polled an overwhelming majority. In each of those elections the winning candidates talked conservative and ran on conservative platforms. That is the record.

Significant as this evidence is, it does not diminish the political difficulties facing conservatives today. While they are a great majority of the registered Republicans, and a possible majority of the Democrats, they are blocked out and ignored at the policy-making level in both parties.

While conservatives are impotent at national levels, their voting numbers are decisive at most state, district, and local levels. Therefore, if this analysis is correct, the two pro-socialist parties must be fought at the state and local ballot-boxes, where conservatives can win.

How can this be done? Certainly it cannot be done by waiting until shortly before election, then finding that the "pros" have rigged the choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Instead, strategy by conservatives should begin for the next election as soon as the ballots for the last one are counted.

But before strategy can be formulated it is essential that the alternatives available are explored. To break up the present pro-socialist two-party cartel, four ballot-box alternatives are open to the conservative:

(1) He can abstain from voting.

(2) He can vote the New Deal Democratic ticket.

(3) He can fight for conservative control of the Republican ticket.

(4) He can vote for third-party or independent candidates.

These are the alternatives — there are no others. Accordingly, an accurate appraisal of

---

* FDR in 1932 repeatedly promised to cut the expenses of the Federal Government by 25 per cent.

** Eisenhower promised to cut Federal expenditures down to $60 billion within four years.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their merits and demerits is the first step in preparing winning tactics.

(1) The Conservative Can Abstain from Voting. With both parties socialist-bound, and elections a popularity contest *sans* principles, nonparticipation seems to make sense. Not so. Passive resistance does no good. Worse still, it simplifies elections for the party machines. It makes the "bought vote" decisive. In short, it has no merit except to indicate contempt for rigged elections, without supplying any remedy.

(2) The Conservative Can Vote the Democratic (New Deal) Ticket. This alternative will probably shock many life-long Republicans. To vote for Democrats, especially New Dealers, seems like the height of folly. Many thousands of traditional GOP voters obviously followed this tactic in the last election, particularly in farm states. Undoubtedly many will do so in '58 and '60. By embracing the New Deal, lock, stock and barrel — believe such disgruntled Republicans — GOP leaders have betrayed those who elected them.

This tactic is supported by the following persuasive argument: only defeat can discredit and dislodge the present GOP rulers. If the voters quickly demonstrate that a Republican regime wedded to socialism cannot win, that blow, plus the resulting loss of prestige and patronage, could give conservatives a chance to regain control of the GOP.

(3) The Conservative Can Fight for Conservative Control of the Republican Ticket. Many conservatives are impressed by the claim that their only hope is to vote Republican and work in the GOP for a change of direction. The apparent advantages of this tactic need to be considered.

The Republican party has historically been a conservative party. It has always commanded the allegiance of most conservatives outside of the South. Conservatives still make up the great bulk of its members. Moreover, at state and local levels many true conservatives still hold party office. In view of these factors, is it not wise for conservatives to work in the GOP to regain control by conservative leaders?

HOWEVER ATTRACTIVE this course may seem, history warns us with several sensational failures. Consider conservatives who supported Hitler in Germany. They expected that, "by going along," they could remold and redirect his policies towards conservatism — so reports a disillusioned Herman Rauschning. Instead, they were used as Judas goats to bring the stolid German rank and file under Hitler's spell. Their conservative support gave him the respectability and prestige that insured his rise to complete power.

Similarly, the fate of the Democratic party does not offer too much encouragement for this course. In the first New Deal years, many Democratic conservatives swallowed their principles and "stayed hitched." They hoped to regain control by staying in. Yet the party moved farther and farther to the Left and in the last election Adlai Stevenson, candidate of the ADA, was the Democratic standard-bearer.

However, all signs now suggest that both parties are in a state of tremendous internal convulsion. North and South in the Democratic party are pulling apart. The 20-year-old bases of the Democratic party — labor and urban minorities — are crumbling. In the GOP, the rank and file (witness the economy wave against the Ike Budget) are in serious revolt against the President and head of the party. And this at a time when that head of the party must retire, by law, at the end of his term. The power of Eisenhower is fading and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it seems unlikely that he can dictate the naming of the next nominee.

Therefore, many conservatives hope that they can select a conservative as the next Republican candidate for the Presidency. But, if they do not or cannot develop party power in the present fluid situation, if they follow "Judas goats," then indeed the Republican party is doomed.

(4) Conservatives Can Vote for Third-Party or Independent Candidates. This tactic looks pretty hopeless at first glance. Third parties have a mortality record that would dampen the ardor of all but the most dauntless Americans.

Yet the Republican party itself started as a third-party movement. One mute bit of evidence favoring this course of action is the harsh intensity with which both major parties attack efforts to launch a new party. Perhaps they know better than the rest of us the real threat a new party offers to their rule. Also, note that the left wing of the Democratic party — the ADA — at certain times threatens to support a third force, a "Labor Party." As a threat, the suggestion of a "third party" could prove useful to conservatives in getting control of the GOP, as suggested in (3).

Moreover, a start towards a third party occurred in 1956. If enough conservatives should decide that this method is the way out, the tactic might prove successful. But the road is a rocky one. In any case, if course (3) seems likely to fail, conservatives can place their hopes and energies behind course (4).

AS THIS SUMMARY indicates, the alternatives facing conservatives all have problems. None of them offers a simple and easy solution for the question, "Where Do Conservatives Go From Here?"

However, a potentially decisive factor still favors conservatives. Although divided, their numbers constitute a majority of American citizens. In the past few weeks a great awakening has occurred among millions of these people. They see as a reality today what they would have dismissed as a bad dream only six months ago — the spectacle of two major parties controlled by men whose love of power causes them to follow policies that inevitably end in socialism.

The American people do not willingly march into socialism, honestly labelled as such. But they cannot stop that march until the correct tactics for resistance are found and utilized. The time has come when conservatives should study and discuss the four alternatives offered above.

Selecting the correct course, the correct tactic, is the paramount task of American conservatives in 1957.

Mr. Buffett, a life-long Republican, served four terms in Congress, representing the 2nd District of Nebraska. He retired voluntarily in 1952, and returned to private business. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The War We Are Losing: The Struggle With Inflation," April 7, 1956.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "BEWARE THE JUDAS GOAT"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately – at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED